REMARKS

The Office communication mailed June 6, 2007 states that the reply filed on March 15, 2007 in connection with the above-identified application was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because a proper species election was not made. In particular, Group I drawn to a method of using a compound of the formula of claim 2, where both R1 and R2 are aryl was elected, wherein the species election was drawn to a compound wherein R1 is aryl (*i.e.*, substituted phenyl) and R2 is heteroaryl (*i.e.*, triazole).

Applicants respectfully submit that Group I was elected in error, and that the election of Group II (Claims 1, 2 (in part), 5-9, 11, 22-23 and 26-34, are drawn to a method for treating or preventing MD in a patient by administering a compound according to the formula in claim 2, where R1 is aryl and R2 is heteroary) was intended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Group II be examined in the present application.

Applicants maintain the species election of 3-(3-(2-(piperidin-1-yl)ethoxy)phenyl)-5-(1H-1,2,4-triazol-3-yl)-1H-indazole (*see* Specification at page 21, line 6), which has the following structure:

This species is drawn to a compound wherein R1 is aryl and R2 is heteroaryl and, accordingly, falls within Group II.

ATI-2276586v1 - 2 -

Applicants respectfully request that the above remarks be entered in the present application file. No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Supplemental Response; however, in the event that any fee is due, please charge the required fee to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-3013.

Date: June 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

(Inthry M. Lucopa, Res. No. 35,203

By: Michael J. Bruner (Reg. No. 47,458)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(404) 581-8614

For: Anthony M. Insogna (Reg. No. 35,203) JONES DAY 12265 El Camino Real, Suite 200 San Diego, California 92130 (858) 314-1130